Procurement Vendor Data Standard Implementation Guide

Version 1.0
December 3, 2009
Revised:

Authors and Contributors:
Vendor Data Standard Owners
as listed in this document

Procurement Vendor Data Standard Implementation Guidance

Table of Contents

Vendor Data Standard Owners

The owners responsible for the development and ongoing maintenance of the Commonwealth's Vendor Data Standard are as follows:

- Division of Purchases & Supply (DPS), Department of General Services – Ron Bell, Director
- Department of Accounts (DOA) – David Von Moll, State Comptroller
- Virginia Information Technologies Agency (VITA) – George Coulter, CIO

The Data Stewards associated with each agency are as follows:

- DPS – Bob Sievert and Becky Barnett
- DOA – Randy McCabe and Kim White
- VITA – Eric Link and Susan Woolley

The VITA Enterprise Application Division (EAD) has supported the development of the vendor data standard and has reviewed it for completeness and accuracy according to data management best practices.   The EAD resources responsible for supporting the vendor standard are as follows:

- VITA EAD – Peggy Feldmann, Chief Applications Officer
- VITA EAD – Nadine Hoffman, Data Manager
- VITA EAD – John Morgan, Enterprise Data Architect

Record of Changes

Version	Date	Description of Change	Contact

Components of the Vendor Data Standard

The Vendor Data Standard consists of the following components:

1. A narrative describing the standard.

2. A drillable data model which can be viewed by going to
   http://www.vita.virginia.gov/oversight/EDM/Vendor/index.htm
   (After clicking the link, click the "+" on the left of the page to drill into the model)

3. Data definition reports derived from the data model which can be viewed by going to
   http://www.vita.virginia.gov/uploadedFiles/Oversight/EA/Data_Management_Group/DPS
   VendorStandardDataDictionary.pdf

Note: Within this document the term "vendor" used by itself means "procurement vendor." Vendor and Procurement Vendor are both defined in the vendor data standard business narrative document.

Introduction

The Vendor Data Standard contains a full data model with dozens of tables and hundreds of data elements. The model defines the business meaning of data elements, specifies data relationships and indicates data types for each data element. When a data standard contains this much detail, an obvious question is "what is really mandatory and where can an implementer take liberties?" Or "What does full implementation require?" This introduction addresses those questions.

A standard data model states that, based upon extensive research and discussion, for a system to support all the data that the COV needs in the Vendor subject area, the system must include all of the data in the model.

A logical data model which is part of a standard represents all the known vendor data which is needed by any agency. The model as a standard does not state that every agency must carry all data in the model. Agencies only need to maintain the data they need. A logical data model does state that if an agency locally maintains some or all data in the model, the data must designed to be consistent with the model.

Relationships

When the model represents a relationship, it states that any system that intends to support the COV's needs must support the minimum complexity shown. It does not prohibit an agency from creating a system or buying a product with general structures which support a superset of functionality. Nor does the model demand that applications have tables which exactly correspond to the model. It does require that applications be able to receive and store data in a way that the business meaning of the model is preserved.

Data Elements

Data element lengths and types should be considered as <u>strongly recommended</u> – just short of binding. In some cases, using shorter or longer lengths will make the intended usage impossible by creating a situation where one system sends data which is longer than a receiving system can accept. Using a numeric data type where a standard specifies character, will set the stage for errors if a coding scheme changes from using only numerals to using numerals and letters.

Agencies should avoid using specified data element names with any meaning other than what is specified in the standard. Agency data dictionaries should make it clear if legacy system name data elements are in conflict with the standard. It is expected that the data defined in the standard will often be stored under various aliases. Agency data dictionaries will refer to the standard data element names in the definitions.

Implementation Freedoms

The model is biased toward business clarity and does not mandate a specific physical implementation. Here are some examples of freedoms which an implementer might exercise and still comply with the standard.

1. The model may show a series of flags, but an implementation could represent each flag by a row in a table. Showing such a table in the data standard could obscure the business meaning of the flags.
2. A model may show an entity with separate tables for sub-types, but an implementation could roll the sub-types into one table.
3. The model shows a separate address table which contains all addresses. An implementation

might have addresses in various tables and have some method to apply address changes to all appropriate addresses.
4. The model represents Taxpayer Identification Number (a combination of SSN and EIN) as one field and has a type code to distinguish between the two types. An implementation could have separate SSN and EIN fields.

The examples above are by no means exhaustive but should give an experienced designer a sense of the spirit of the standard. For specifics, please refer to the Notes attached to each entity and attribute in the model; many of them will contain comments about implementation. Any questions or suggestions related to a data model standard should be sent to the Data Management Group of the VITA Enterprise Applications Division (VEAD) with copies to the Data Owners and Data Stewards identified in this document.

Implementation Strategies

Phase I – Meet Mandated Requirements

To meet the requirements of Chapter 758, on or before July 1, 2010, DPS and DOA shall:

- Establish processes to collect W9/W8 Vendor information for all Procurement Vendors. (DPS and DOA)
- Configure the current eVA registration application as necessary to support all mandatory Procurement Vendor attributes (DPS)
- Develop a Vendor information web-service XML request/reply process for the near real-time distribution of vendor information. (DPS)
- Establish data exchange security requirements. (VITA EAD)
- Define policies and procedures for the review of state agency and institution compliance with this data standard. (DPS and DOA)

On or before July 1, 2010, all agencies with an independent financial system shall:
- Ensure that all payment transactions use the eVA vendor location standard name.
- Use the vendor W9/W8 data, as entered in eVA.
- When available, use the electronic copy of W9 and W8 forms stored within the eVA vendor registration system.
- Ensure that all Procurement Vendor data utilized for purchasing or financial transactions is eVA vendor registration data. This includes vendor data referenced on all contracts, purchase orders, and change orders.
- Cease using any procurement vendor which is not in the eVA vendor registration system.

Phase II Broader Implementation

By a date to be determined by DOA and DPS:

- Incorporate EDI data into eVA in coordination with DOA's modification to its policies and trading partner agreements. (DGS project with DOA)

- Establish a vendor approval process for the sharing of EDI payment information with Commonwealth entities that process payments (DOA project).

- Establish processes and procedures to receive shared EDI payment data if needed. (Project for each agency.)

- Schedule the inclusion of vendor certifications other than SWaM into eVA . This schedule must be coordinated with the regulatory agencies issuing the certifications. (DGS Project)

Strategic Recommendation

By a date yet to be determined, DGS, VITA and DOA jointly recommend implementing an application-independent vendor data repository that is fully compliant with the entire Vendor Data Standard and that provides a single authoritative source for all Vendor information required to support the procure-to-pay business process.   This authoritative data source shall be known as the Commonwealth Consolidated Vendor Data Repository and will offer a Vendor Portal for the management of all vendor data defined within this data standard.

It is the intent of this standard that the final Commonwealth Vendor Data Repository be an independent data repository and application that collects and distributes vendor information to all authorized users.

The Consolidated Vendor Data Repository will have the following characteristics:

- Be application independent

- Meet IRS requirements for maintenance of an electronic copy of the vendor W9/W8 information which shall be used by all Commonwealth entities to determine tax reporting and withholding requirements.

- Assign a unique Virginia controlled vendor location identifier.

- Capture data entities and attributes as described in this standard's Entity Relationship Model and associated data dictionary.

- Track modifications to key vendor attributes to enable an historical point-in-time view of Vendors.

- Support requests for vendor information based on authorized alternate identifiers.

- Make available vendor information to all Commonwealth entities including but not limited to State Agencies and Institutions, Institutions of Higher Education, Local Governments, Legislative and Judicial Branch Agencies, and all other "buy-side" users of eVA

- Send data requestors only vendor information that is active and current as of the date and time of the data request.

- Make vendor data available via web-service enabled XML files, to all secondary vendor repositories as soon as a vendor is activated by the approval authority.

- Convert existing eVA vendor data into the repository

- Provide a mechanism for agencies to associate locally maintained vendor identifiers with the Vendor Location Identifier and retrieve that data using a service call.

Unresolved Issues

Issues that will need to be addressed include:

- Establish an ownership model for maintenance and support of the repository

- Consistent with the ownership model, identify and establish funding model to maintain and support the repository.   (DOA and DGS and possibly VITA will have ongoing costs requirements for the repository)

- Determine the who, how, and when related to establishing the technical and organizational components to support interagency communications.